

CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

Volume IV

August, 1933

Number 8

CONTENTS

	Page
Directory of the State Department of Education.....	252
Major Problems Confronting Public Education in California.....	253
Major Changes in School Finance Resulting from 1933 Legislation.....	256
Departmental Communications.....	275
Interpretations of School Law.....	279
For Your Information.....	281
Professional Literature.....	282



**Official Publication Issued Monthly by the
California State Department of Education**

Entered as second-class matter May 8, 1930, at the Post Office at Sacramento, California,
under the Act of August 24, 1912

DIRECTORY OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

	Term expires
Dr. Lewis P. Crutcher, Long Beach (President).....	1936
Allen T. Archer, 215 West Sixth street, Los Angeles.....	1935
E. P. Clarke, Riverside.....	1936
Miss Alice H. Dougherty, 4508 Pleasant Valley court, Oakland.....	1936
R. E. Golway, Sacramento.....	1935
Gordon Gray, Bank of America Building, San Diego.....	1934
Daniel C. Murphy, 90 Justin drive, San Francisco.....	1934
Mrs. Florence C. Porter, Bakersfield.....	1937
Miss Alice Rose Power, 233 Claremont, San Francisco.....	1935

Vierling Kersey, Secretary and Executive Officer
Mrs. Florence B. Argall, Assistant Secretary

STAFF

(Unless otherwise indicated all staff members may be reached at Sacramento)

Vierling Kersey, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Director of Education
Pauline Winner (Mrs.), Administrative Assistant
Alfred E. Lentz, Administrative Adviser
Marion H. Ketcham, Assistant Secretary and Principal Clerk, Public School Teachers' Retirement Salary Fund Board
Henry M. Lynn, Departmental Accountant
Sam H. Cohn, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction
Walter E. Morgan, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction and Chief of Division of Research and Statistics
C. F. Muncy, Assistant Chief
Irene Taylor Heineman (Mrs.), Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, 311 California State Building, Los Angeles
Ivan R. Waterman, Chief of Division of Textbooks and Publications
W. S. Dyas, Chief of Bureau of State Printed Textbooks
Evelyn A. Clement (Mrs.), Chief of Division of Teacher Training and Certification
J. C. Beswick, Assistant Executive Officer, Commission for Vocational Education and Chief of Bureau of Trade and Industrial Education
Julian A. McPhee, Chief of Bureau of Agricultural Education
Ira W. Kibby, Chief of Bureau of Business Education
Maude I. Murchie, Chief of Bureau of Home-Making Education
H. D. Hicker, Chief of Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation
J. M. Dodd, District Supervisor of Vocational Rehabilitation, 303 State Building, San Francisco
W. E. Smith, District Supervisor of Vocational Rehabilitation, 107 California State Building, Los Angeles
L. B. Travers, Chief of Division of Adult and Continuation Education, 311 California State Building, Los Angeles
Gertrude Laws, Bureau of Parent Education, 311 California State Building, Los Angeles
Helen Heffernan, Chief of Division of Elementary Education and Rural Schools
Gladys L. Potter (Mrs.), Assistant Chief
N. P. Neilson, Chief of Division of Health and Physical Education
Winifred Van Hagen, Chief of Bureau of Physical Education for Girls
Mabel R. Gillis, State Librarian, Chief of Division of Libraries
Eleanor Hitt, Assistant Librarian
Andrew P. Hill, Jr., Chief of Division of Schoolhouse Planning
Charles W. Bursch, Assistant Chief
J. A. Burkman, Research Expert and Adviser for Teachers Colleges
Nicholas Ricciardi, Chief of Division of Secondary Education
_____, Chief of Division of Special Education
R. S. French, Chief of Bureau for the Education of the Blind, Principal, California School for the Blind, Berkeley
Elwood A. Stevenson, Chief of Bureau for the Education of the Deaf, Principal, California School for the Deaf, Berkeley
Lillian B. Hill (Mrs.), Chief of Bureau of Mental Hygiene
Mabel F. Gifford (Mrs.), Chief of Bureau of Correction of Speech Defects, 317 State Building, San Francisco

CALIFORNIA STATE PRINTING OFFICE
 HARRY HAMMOND, STATE PRINTER
 SACRAMENTO, 1933

Major Problems Confronting Public Education in California

VIERLING KERSEY, *Superintendent of Public Instruction*

The critical period for public education in California and throughout the nation has not yet passed. Unfavorable economic conditions during the past few years have caused insufficient funds to be available for the support of adequate educational programs and, as a result, educational services have been curtailed or impaired, many schools have been closed, and in general the efficiency of the schools has been lowered. This injury to educational programs has been detrimental to the general public welfare.

Although current conditions seem to indicate that the present critical period is rapidly coming to a close, the effects of the economic depression upon public education have been so serious and widespread that they will undoubtedly be felt for years to come. Certain problems accentuated in importance by the depression have become of immediate concern and demand immediate solution if recovery and readjustment is to proceed.

It is well to recall at this point the purpose and function of public education in a democratic social order. Very early in the history of American democracy public education was conceived as a necessary safeguard to the preservation of ideals of liberty and equality of opportunity. A high level of intelligence on the part of the citizenry and a general diffusion of knowledge and culture were considered indispensable to the success of government by the people themselves. Public education originated in these purposes and was expanded over a long period of years in order that these purposes might be more fully realized. The institution of free public education has assumed a unique position in American life. It has become firmly established in American tradition as the agency which makes possible the realization of democratic ideals and the achievement of further progress of a democratic social order.

Events of the past few years have shown that there is danger of losing sight of the fundamental significance of public education in American life due to the pressure of existing conditions. The extreme severity of economic conditions, particularly the greatly reduced buying power of the vast majority, and tax systems poorly adjusted to the relative ability of persons to pay, seemed for a time to be factors more

influential than the function of public education in maintaining democratic government and assuring the stability of a democratic social order.

Now, when general economic conditions are changing for the better, it should be possible to obtain a better perspective of the total situation, and to avoid attaching undue importance to factors arising from a temporary though serious emergency situation. In the attack upon problems of public education now demanding solution, it is necessary to keep uppermost in mind and give foremost consideration to the functions which public education in a democratic society is expected to serve.

The economic depression has been the immediate cause of a careful scrutiny of all agencies and functions of government. Particularly has public education been the subject of this scrutiny. Both laymen and educators have been stimulated to a critical evaluation of educational services performed and the degree of efficiency with which schools are operated. This evaluation has led to the isolation of a few problems which are of major importance in the immediate future. It is highly important that the intelligence and concentrated attention of all those interested in the welfare of public education be directed to the solution of these problems.

The California State Department of Education has from its analysis of conditions listed the following subjects which it believes should form the basis of intensive study during the immediate future.

- I. Local Units of School Administration
- II. Tenure of Professional Personnel
- III. Methods of Support of Public Education
- IV. Public Education and the Public
- V. Reorganization of Educational Programs

Each of these subjects will be discussed at some length in a series of articles in subsequent numbers of *California Schools*.

To provide a means of attacking the problems involved in these subjects, the Superintendent of Public Instruction will ask the aid of a series of committees composed of representative educators throughout the state to cooperate with the State Department of Education in the study of specific problems. The State Department of Education has planned to devote a large share of its time, energy, and facilities of its professional personnel during the coming year to the solution of these problems of major importance to the educational welfare of the state.

First of all, it will be necessary to analyze carefully each problem resolving the separate issues involved. It will be necessary to collect and compile all available pertinent data relating to these problems in

order that conclusions will be based upon factual information rather than upon false or faulty premises. The basic purpose and function of public education in a democratic social order must be constantly held in mind in order that proposed solutions to specific problems may be in entire accord with the larger purpose which public education is intended to serve.

The problems demanding solution are complex and many issues are involved. Divergent points of view and conflicting opinion with regard to their solution exist. The hope is here expressed that through the cooperative endeavor of educators throughout the state apparent conflicts may be resolved and that solutions to these problems may be developed which are generally acceptable and which will aid in furthering the fundamental purposes of public education in a democratic society.

Major Changes in School Finance Resulting From 1933 Legislation

WALTER E. MORGAN, *Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction
and Chief, Division of Research and Statistics*

REVISION OF STATE AND COUNTY SUPPORT FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AND HIGH SCHOOLS

Enactment of Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 30 by the people on June 27, 1933, effected a radical change in former methods of financing the public elementary and high schools of California. Assembly Bills No. 2440 and No. 2442, designed to give effect to the provisions of the constitutional amendment, will make the new method of school finance effective during the current school year, 1933-34. In this statement an analysis is presented of the effects of these bills as they relate to the school district budgets and county school tax estimates for this year.

It should be noted that *all* school district budgets and *all* county school tax estimates already prepared for the current school year in accordance with the provisions of the School Code which have until now been in effect, will have to be revised. Moreover, the procedures involved in the submission of district budgets and county estimates have also been changed. Thus it is imperative that county superintendents of schools and other school budgetary officials take into consideration the information provided herein and take all necessary steps to insure the submission of legally correct school district budgets and county school tax estimates.

ELIMINATION OF COUNTY SCHOOL TAXES

Assembly Bill No. 2442, amending the School Code so as to give effect to the change in school finance required by Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 30, eliminates all county school taxes for elementary schools and for high schools. Thus, there will be no county school taxes levied this year for elementary schools or for high schools.

County Superintendents' Tax Estimates

Estimates of county elementary and high school taxes already submitted for the current school year, 1933-34, by county superintendents of schools to county boards of supervisors are specifically declared null and void by Assembly Bill No. 2442. In lieu of these county estimates which have been declared void, county superintendents of schools are required to submit to the Superintendent of Public Instruction estimates of the amounts required for the current school year for the unapportioned county elementary school fund and for the unapportioned county high school fund. These new estimates will be discussed later.

APPORTIONMENTS FROM THE STATE GENERAL FUND

In lieu of the heretofore required county taxes for the support of elementary schools and high schools, Assembly Bill No. 2442 substitutes apportionments to the several counties from the STATE GENERAL FUND. These apportionments from the STATE GENERAL FUND are intended to provide in each county amounts identical with the amounts previously required by the constitution to be levied by county school taxes.

GENERAL FUND APPORTIONMENTS FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

For elementary schools, apportionments will be made to each county in such manner as to provide an amount computed by comparing the amount apportioned to the county during the school year from the STATE SCHOOL FUND with an amount equal to \$30 per unit of average daily attendance in the elementary schools of the county during the preceding school year. The larger of the two amounts will be the amount apportioned to the county from the STATE GENERAL FUND.

Unapportioned County Elementary School Fund

From the amount apportioned to each county from the STATE GENERAL FUND, the Superintendent of Public Instruction is required to deduct, and to apportion to the unapportioned county elementary school fund of the county, an amount estimated by the county superintendent of schools, but not to exceed 5 per cent of the amount received by the county during the preceding school year from the STATE SCHOOL FUND. This fund will be available for use for all of the purposes for which the unapportioned county elementary school fund has been employed previously. These purposes, and the procedure involved in the county superintendent's estimate of the fund will be indicated under the caption County Superintendents' Estimates of Unapportioned County School Funds.

Estimates of State Apportionments for Elementary Schools

In Table No. 1 are given revised estimates of the elementary school average daily attendance in each county during the school year 1932-33, the number of teacher units allowed each county on the basis of that average daily attendance for apportionment purposes during the current school year, 1933-34, and the apportionment to be made to each county from the STATE SCHOOL FUND during the current school year.

Table No. 2 presents an estimate, based upon the data contained in Table No. 1 of the amount which will be apportioned this year to each county from the STATE GENERAL FUND. In column 1 is given the revised estimate of the apportionment to be made this year from the STATE SCHOOL FUND to each county. Column 2 shows the amount required to provide \$30 for each unit of average daily attendance in elementary schools during 1932-33. Column 3 then gives the total amount of the required apportionment to each county from the STATE GENERAL FUND. This amount is the larger of the two amounts entered in columns 1 and 2.

Unapportioned County Elementary School Fund Apportionments

In column 4 of Table No. 2, is indicated the *maximum* amount which may be requested by each county superintendent of schools as an apportionment to the unapportioned county elementary school fund. This amount is equal to 5 per cent of the total apportionment received by the county during the preceding school year, 1932-33, from the STATE SCHOOL FUND. The amount entered in column 4 of Table No. 2 for each county should be reduced by (1) the amount of the balance in the unapportioned county elementary school fund on July 1, 1933; by (2) the amount of estimated receipts to the unapportioned county elementary school fund during the current school year, 1933-34, from the United States forest reserve fund; by (3) the amount of estimated receipts during the current school year from fees for teachers' certificates; and (4) estimated amounts to be transferred from surpluses in school district funds and in the county elementary school supervision fund. The total amount of the unapportioned county elementary school fund for each county should be based upon known and anticipated needs. The maximum amount which may be received for this fund from state apportionments may not exceed 5 per cent of the apportionment to the county from the STATE SCHOOL FUND during the preceding school year.

General Fund Apportionments to County Elementary School Supervision Fund

The county elementary school supervision funds of the several counties will continue, as in the past, to receive an annual apportionment of \$1400 for each 300 or major fraction (150 plus) of 300 units of average daily attendance in the aggregate in those elementary school districts of the county having less than 300 units of average daily attendance. One-half of the supervision fund apportionment will come from the STATE SCHOOL FUND, as previously, the other one-half to be apportioned from the STATE GENERAL FUND.

General Fund Apportionments to Elementary School Districts

The balance of the amount to which each county will be entitled as an apportionment from the STATE GENERAL FUND will be apportioned to the elementary school districts of the county as follows:

1. \$700 will be allowed for each teacher unit, as from the STATE SCHOOL FUND.
2. Each district will receive on-half of the excess cost of educating physically handicapped children during the preceding school year, as from the STATE SCHOOL FUND.
3. The balance of the amount allowed the county for elementary schools from the STATE GENERAL FUND will be prorated to the several elementary school districts of the county on average daily attendance.

STATE GENERAL FUND APPORTIONMENTS FOR HIGH SCHOOLS

In place of the former county high school support, each county will receive an apportionment from the STATE GENERAL FUND sufficient to

provide a total amount computed by comparing twice the amount of the apportionment to the county during the school year from the STATE HIGH SCHOOL FUND with an amount equal to \$60 per unit of average daily attendance in the high schools of the county during the preceding school year. The larger of the two amounts will be the amount to be received by the county for high schools from the STATE GENERAL FUND.

Unapportioned County High School Fund

From the total amount to be apportioned to each county for high schools from the STATE GENERAL FUND, the Superintendent of Public Instruction will be required to deduct, and apportion to the unapportioned county high school fund of the county, the amount estimated by the county superintendent of schools as necessary for such fund during the current school year, provided such amount does not exceed 5 per cent of the apportionment received by the county during the preceding school year from the STATE HIGH SCHOOL FUND. Balances in the unapportioned county high school fund on July 1 and estimated receipts from teachers' certificate fees will be deducted in computing the amount to be apportioned from the STATE GENERAL FUND.

General Fund Apportionments to High School Districts

The remainder of the STATE GENERAL FUND apportionment to each county, after deducting the amount to be apportioned to the unapportioned county high school fund, will be apportioned directly to the high school districts of the county as follows:

1. \$250 will be allowed for each of grades 9-14, inclusive, maintained in each junior high school, four-year high school, senior high school, evening high school, or junior college (not district junior colleges).
2. \$40 will be allowed for each of the first 10 units of average daily attendance in special day and evening classes in each high school; \$30 for each of the second 10 units; and \$20 for each of the third 10 units.
3. Each high school district will receive one-half of the excess cost of educating physically handicapped pupils, as from the STATE HIGH SCHOOL FUND.
4. \$1000 will be allowed each new high school district.
5. The balance of the STATE GENERAL FUND apportionment to the county will be prorated to the several high school districts on average daily attendance.

Estimates of State Apportionments for High Schools

In Table No. 3 revised estimates of the average daily attendance and years maintained in high schools during the school year 1932-33, and of the amounts to be apportioned from the STATE HIGH SCHOOL FUND to each county during the current school year, 1933-34, are given for each county.

Table No. 4 shows the computation of the apportionment to each county from the STATE GENERAL FUND for high school support. Column 1 of Table No. 4 gives the total amount to be apportioned to each county from the STATE HIGH SCHOOL FUND. Column 2 shows the amount required from the STATE GENERAL FUND at twice the amount of

the apportionment from the STATE HIGH SCHOOL FUND. Column 3 shows the amount required at \$60 per unit of average daily attendance. In column 4 the total required apportionment for each county from the STATE GENERAL FUND is given, as the larger of the two amounts entered in columns 2 and 3.

Column 5 of Table No. 4 indicates the *maximum* amount which may be apportioned to the unapportioned county high school fund of each county. This is equal to five per cent of the apportionment received by the county during the preceding school year from the STATE HIGH SCHOOL FUND. The amounts tabulated in column 5 will be reduced in accordance with estimates submitted by county superintendents of schools.

Column 6 of Table 4 indicates the balance of the county apportionment from the STATE GENERAL FUND for high school support which will be available to apportion to the several high school districts.

STATE APPORTIONMENTS IN TEN PAYMENTS

Under the terms of Assembly Bill No. 2442, the total amount of the state apportionments from the STATE SCHOOL FUND, the STATE HIGH SCHOOL FUND, and the STATE GENERAL FUND will be paid by the State Treasurer on order of the State Controller to the treasury of each county to be placed to the credit of the several county school funds and school districts as indicated in the apportionment made by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in ten equal monthly payments, beginning in September. This spreading of the state apportionments over the year is necessary in view of the fact that the state taxes, particularly the sales tax, will be collected throughout the year rather than in one or two payments.

In accordance with section 6 of Article IX of the Constitution, all apportionments from the STATE SCHOOL FUND and STATE HIGH SCHOOL FUND, and 60 per cent of all apportionments from the STATE GENERAL FUND must be used exclusively for teachers' salaries.

MIGRATORY SCHOOLS

Under the provisions of Assembly Bill No. 2442, the STATE MIGRATORY SCHOOL REVOLVING FUND is abolished, and the method of support of special schools or classes for the children of migratory laborers engaged in seasonal industries is changed. The county superintendent of schools will be authorized to support these schools or classes by apportionments from the unapportioned county elementary school fund, with the approval of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, not to exceed \$150 per month per teacher employed therein.

COUNTY SUPERINTENDENTS' ESTIMATES OF UNAPPORTIONED COUNTY SCHOOL FUNDS

Forms No. J-70 and J-71, which will be provided by the State Department of Education, should be employed by county superintendents of schools in submitting to the Superintendent of Public Instruction estimates of the amounts needed for the unapportioned county elementary and high school funds, as required in Assembly Bill No. 2442. These estimates must be filed with the Superintendent of Public Instruction on or before August 20, 1933, for the school year 1933-34, and on or before July 15 of each year thereafter.

Form No. J-70

California State Department of Education

**ESTIMATE OF UNAPPORTIONED COUNTY ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL FUND**

for-----County

for the School Year beginning July 1, 1933, and ending June 30, 1934.

**A. Estimated Expenditures from Unapportioned County Elementary
School Fund, July 1, 1933, to June 30, 1934.**

1. For county teachers' institute----- \$-----
2. For county trustees' institute----- -----
3. For teachers' salaries in emergency schools----- -----
4. For transportation of pupils otherwise unable to
attend school ----- -----
5. For county teachers' library----- -----
6. For apportionments to elementary school dis-
tricts for "migratory schools" at not to exceed
\$150 per month per teacher----- -----
7. For salary and expense of county attendance
supervision ----- -----
8. For emergency apportionments to elementary
school districts ----- -----
9. Total estimated expenditures----- \$-----

**B. Estimated Income to Unapportioned County Elementary School
Fund, 1933-34.**

1. Balance in fund, July 1, 1933----- \$-----
2. Estimated receipts from United States forest
reserve fund ----- -----
3. Estimated receipts from teachers' certificate fees ----- -----
4. Estimated amount to be transferred from surplus
of school district funds and county elementary
school supervision fund----- -----
5. Total estimated income other than state appor-
tionments ----- \$-----

C. Amount required by apportionment from the State General Fund

(Item A, 9 minus item B, 5)----- \$-----

Date-----193-- Signed-----

County Superintendent of Schools

Form No. J-71

California State Department of Education

ESTIMATE OF UNAPPORTIONED COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL FUND

for _____ County

for the School Year beginning July 1, 1933, and ending June 30, 1934.

A. Estimate of Expenditures from Unapportioned County High School Fund, July 1, 1933, to June 30, 1934.

1. For county teachers' institute_____ \$_____
2. For county trustees' institute_____ _____
3. For county teachers' library_____ _____
4. For salary and expense of county attendance supervision _____ _____
5. For reimbursement of high school districts for transportation of pupils not residing in a high school district _____ _____
6. For reimbursement of high school districts for cost of textbooks furnished pupils not residing in a high school district _____ _____
7. For emergency apportionments to high school districts _____ _____
8. Total estimated expenditures_____ \$_____

B. Estimated Income to Unapportioned County High School Fund, 1933-34.

1. Balance in fund, July 1, 1933_____ \$_____
2. Estimated receipts from teachers' certificate fees _____ _____
3. Total estimated income other than state apportionments _____ \$_____

C. Amount required by apportionment from the State General Fund

(Item A, 8 minus item B, 3) _____ \$_____

Date_____193__ Signed_____

County Superintendent of Schools

SCHOOL DISTRICT BUDGETS

All school district budgets submitted for the school year 1933-34 will require revision by county superintendents of schools so that a proper distribution of estimated income may be provided therein. Assembly Bill No. 2440 authorizes county superintendents of schools to make such revisions at any time prior to the levy of school district taxes for 1933-34. The following instructions are given for the purpose of facilitating corrections in the budgets now filed with county superintendents of schools.

Elementary School District Budgets

In section A of division II of the elementary school district budget (Estimated Income for Maintenance Purposes), observe the following instructions:

Item 4.—State Apportionments. For each district allow \$700 per teacher unit; plus one-half of excess cost of educating physically handicapped pupils; plus \$5.95 per unit of average daily attendance.

NOTE: The total of the state apportionments to the elementary school districts of each county from the STATE SCHOOL FUND (Item II, A, 3 of the budget), plus apportionments from this fund to the county elementary school supervision fund at \$700 per teacher unit, should equal the amount of the total apportionment from the STATE SCHOOL FUND to the county as indicated in Table No. 1.

Item 5.—County Apportionments. For each district allow the following amounts:

1. \$700 per teacher unit.
2. One-half of excess cost of educating physically handicapped children.
3. For each unit of average daily attendance in the district, allow an amount computed as follows:
 - a. From the total amount of the estimated apportionment to the county from the STATE GENERAL FUND (Column 3, Table No. 2), subtract:
 - 1) apportionments to the unapportioned county elementary school fund (Column 4 of Table No. 2, or the amount estimated by the county superintendent of schools on Form No. J-70).
 - 2) the total amount apportioned to the districts of the county on teacher units at \$700 (item 1, above).
 - 3) the total amount apportioned to the districts of the county for excess cost of educating physically handicapped pupils (item 2, above).
 - 4) apportionments from the STATE GENERAL FUND to the county elementary school supervision fund at \$700 per teacher unit.

- b. Divide the remainder of the total estimated apportionment to the county for elementary schools from the STATE GENERAL FUND (Column 3, Table No. 2) by the total average daily attendance in the elementary schools of the county (Column 1, Table No. 1).
 - c. For each district, multiply the quotient secured in b, above, by the average daily attendance of the district.
4. The total amount to be entered in item II, A, 4 of the elementary school district budget is the sum of items 1, 2, and 3, c, above.

NOTE: This "county apportionment" will be derived entirely from the STATE GENERAL FUND.

High School District Budgets

In section A of division II of the high school district budget (Estimated Income), observes the following in instructions:

Item 2.—State Apportionments. For each new school district allow \$2200, if the district was organized during the school year 1932-33 and no high school was maintained therein during the school year. For every other high school district, allow \$550 for each of grades 9-14, inclusive, maintained during the 1932-33 in each junior, senior, four-year, and evening high school or junior college (not a district junior college); plus \$80 for each of the first 10 units of average daily attendance in special day and evening classes in each high school, \$60 for each of the second 10 units, and \$40 for each of the third 10 units of such average daily attendance; plus one-half of the excess cost of educating physically handicapped pupils; plus \$24.27 for each unit of average daily attendance in the high school district.

NOTE: The total of the state apportionments to the high school districts of each county from the STATE HIGH SCHOOL FUND (Item II, A, 2 of the budget) should equal the total apportionment from the STATE HIGH SCHOOL FUND to the county as indicated in Table 3.

Item 3.—County Apportionments. For each new high school district organized during 1932-33 and not maintaining a high school during the school year, allow \$1000. For every other high school district allow the following amounts:

1. \$250 for each of grades 9-14, inclusive, maintained during the school year 1932-33, in each junior, senior, four-year, and evening high school, or junior college (not in district junior colleges).
2. \$40 for each of the first 10 units of average daily attendance in special day and evening classes in each high school, \$30 for each of the second 10 units, and \$20 for each of the third 10 units of such average daily attendance.
3. One-half of the excess cost of educating physically handicapped pupils.

4. For each unit of average daily attendance in the district, allow an amount computed as follows:

a. From the total amount of the estimated apportionment to the county from the STATE GENERAL FUND (Column 4, Table No. 4), subtract:

1) apportionments to the unapportioned county high school fund (Column 5, Table No. 4, or the amount estimated by the county superintendent of schools on Form No. J-71).

2) the total amounts apportioned to the high school districts of the county under items 1, 2, and 3, above.

b. Divide the remainder of the total estimated apportionment to the county for high schools from the STATE GENERAL FUND (Column 4, Table No. 4) by the total average daily attendance in the high schools of the county (Column 1, Table No. 3).

c. For each district, multiply the quotient secured in b, above, by the average daily attendance of the high school district.

5. The total amount to be entered in item II, A, 3, of the high school district budget is the sum of items 1, 2, 3, and 4, c, above.

NOTE: This "county apportionment" will be derived entirely from the STATE GENERAL FUND.

Junior College District Budgets

Budgets of junior college districts will not be affected by the new legislation, in so far as sources of income are concerned. Table No. 5 presents a revised estimate of the state apportionments for junior college districts during 1933-34. Each district will receive \$2,000 per junior college, plus a pro rata apportionment on average daily attendance of approximately \$73.92. This estimate is based on an estimated receipt of \$400,000 from the United States, plus one-half of the total biennial legislative appropriation of \$2,047,058.

FIVE PER CENT LIMITATION ON INCREASES IN SCHOOL DISTRICT EXPENDITURES

Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 30 and Assembly Bill No. 2442 limit the amount by which a school district may increase its expenditures for any fiscal year to an amount equal to 5 per cent of its expenditures during the preceding school year, unless specific written authorization is granted for greater increases by the State Board of Equalization, or unless a greater increase is authorized by a two-thirds affirmative vote of the electors of the district. Assembly Bill No. 2440 authorizes governing boards of school districts to apply to the State Board of Equalization for permission to exceed this 5 per cent limitation on annual district expenditure increases, such application to be in writing and to be filed at least 30 days before the date fixed for the levy of district taxes. The content of the application form which has been provided for application to the State Board of Equalization through the

Superintendent of Public Instruction for permission to exceed the 5 per cent limitation is shown below and on the following page. Applications will be considered by the State Board of Equalization this year as soon as they are received.

**APPLICATION TO EXCEED LIMITATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICT
EXPENDITURES, 1933-34**

(Political Code section 3714b)

Name of County _____ Name of School District _____
Indicate Elementary, High
School, or Junior College

Date _____, 1933. Post Office Address _____

Instructions—*The original and one copy of this application must be filed on or before August 8, 1933, with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Sacramento, California. Do not send direct to the State Board of Equalization.*

California State Board of Equalization
State Capitol, Sacramento, California

Gentlemen:

Authority is hereby requested by the Governing Board of the above named school district to exceed during the fiscal year 1933-34 the limitation on expenditures set forth in section 20 of Article XI of the Constitution of California.

The following expenditure data, taken from official school records, are presented for your consideration:

Total proposed school district expenditures, 1933-34 (Include Capital
Outlays but not Bond Moneys) _____ \$ _____

Total actual school district expenditures, 1932-33 (Include Capital
Outlays but not Bond Moneys) _____ \$ _____

Total proposed increase _____ \$ _____

Per cent of increase over total expenditures 1932-33 _____ per cent.

Total actual school district expenditures, 1931-32 (Include Capital
Outlays but not Bond Moneys) _____ \$ _____

This proposed increase in school district expenditures is necessary for the reason stipulated below:

1. Material increase in number of pupils to be educated, thereby requiring the employment of one or more additional certificated employees. Explain:

2. Schoolhousing facilities required to be constructed, rebuilt or enlarged, etc. Explain:

3. Other reason. Explain:

The above application is made in pursuance of regular action taken by the governing board of the _____ school district.

Date _____, 1933.

Signed _____
Secretary or Clerk

(over)

SCHOOL DISTRICT FINANCIAL DATA TO BE REPORTED BY THE COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

California State Board of Equalization,
State Capitol, Sacramento, California.

GENTLEMEN:

The following financial data for the _____ school district
are presented for your information:

School District Expenditures

	<i>Actual Expenditures 1932-33</i>	<i>Proposed Expenditures 1933-34</i>	<i>In- crease</i>	<i>De- crease</i>
General Control.....	\$-----	\$-----	\$-----	\$-----
Teachers' Salaries.....	-----	-----	-----	-----
Other Expenses of Instruction.....	-----	-----	-----	-----
Library	-----	-----	-----	-----
Operation of School Plant.....	-----	-----	-----	-----
Maintenance of School Plant.....	-----	-----	-----	-----
Fixed Charges.....	-----	-----	-----	-----
Auxiliary Agencies and Sundry Activities	-----	-----	-----	-----
Laboratory Supplies	-----	-----	-----	-----
Capital Outlays (exclusive of bond moneys)	-----	-----	-----	-----
Transfers to Other School Districts	-----	-----	-----	-----
Totals	\$-----	\$-----	\$-----	\$-----

Per cent of proposed increase in school district expenditures, 1933-34..... per cent.

Total school district assessed valuation, 1933-34

(Secure from County Auditor) \$-----

Total school district tax rate levied 1932-33

Elementary school district

*Tax rate levied
1932-33*

1. Maintenance tax rate.....

2. Building tax rate.....

Or High school district tax rate.....

Or Junior college district tax rate.....

Total tax rate necessary to raise funds for proposed school district
support, 1933-34

Elementary school district

*Proposed tax
rate, 1933-34*

1. Maintenance tax rate.....

2. Building tax rate.....

Or High school district tax rate.....

Or Junior college district tax rate.....

I do hereby verify that the above facts are correct according to the best of my
knowledge and belief, and do recommend that this request ^{be} ~~be not~~ granted.

Date.....1933

Signed.....

County Superintendent of Schools

I have examined the foregoing application and recommend that the request
^{be} ~~be not~~ granted.

Date.....1933

Signed.....

Superintendent of Public Instruction

No legislation has been enacted providing for the calling of an election to authorize expenditure increases in excess of 5 per cent in the event of the rejection of applications by the State Board of Equalization.

Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 30 has been interpreted as imposing a 5 per cent limitation on annual increases in all district expenditures except of moneys derived from the sale of district bonds and moneys expended for the interest on and redemption of district bonds. It has also been construed as authorizing exemptions from the 5 per cent limitation on annual district expenditure increases in districts in which a reduction in district expenditures has been effected in any school year or years subsequent to 1931-1932. School districts will be permitted expenditures, during any school year immediately following the school year or years in which such reductions were effected, equal to the amount expended during the immediately preceding school year, plus all or any part of the amount of the reductions so effected. Thus districts may expend during 1933-1934 as much as they expended in 1931-1932, if reductions in their expenditures were effected in 1932-1933.

Since the above construction may be challenged by local officials, it is advised that requests for authorization to exceed the 5 per cent limitation be filed with the State Board of Equalization for all districts, the 1933-1934 budgets of which show a total proposed expenditures representing more than a 5 per cent increase over 1932-1933 expenditures, not including bond money expenditures. The items which should be considered in the 1933-34 budgets include items I, A and III, A of the elementary school district budget; items I, A and I, B of the high school district budget; and items I, A and I, B of the junior college district budget. Balances to be carried forward for expenditure during 1934-35 (item I, B of the elementary school district budget, and I, C of the high school and junior college budgets) should not be considered as involved in the 5 per cent limitation.

REAPPORTIONMENT OF SURPLUS DISTRICT FUNDS

Assembly Bill No. 2442 requires the county superintendent of schools during July or August of each year to apportion to the unapportioned county elementary school fund 80 per cent of any surplus balance in the funds of any elementary school district not derived from district taxes. If elementary school district budgets show anticipated income from other sources than district taxes in excess of proposed expenditures such excess amounts will be subject to transfer to the unapportioned county elementary school fund after August 21 of this year.

FEDERAL FOREST RESERVE FUNDS

No change has been effected in the status of United States forest reserve funds received by the counties for the unapportioned county elementary school fund.

COUNTY TAXES ON INTANGIBLE SECURITIES AND SOLVENT CREDITS

No change has been effected in the county rates and levy of taxes on intangible securities and solvent credits nor in the method of allocating moneys derived from these taxes.

SCHOOL DISTRICT TAXES

Assembly Bill No. 1078 retains the present maximum rates which may be levied without an election, but provides that if an election is called to increase the maximum rates the increased rates must be specified as must also the period for which the increased maximum rates are to be valid. Assembly Bill No. 2306 modifies Assembly Bill No. 1078, however, to the extent of providing that increases in maximum school district tax rates heretofore voted by the electors of a school district shall remain in effect until July 1, 1934. Thereafter, to again increase the maximum district tax rate, the voters of the district must again vote such increase, but only for a specified period, as provided in Assembly Bill No. 1078.

Assembly Bill No. 1078 also prohibits the county auditor from crediting to the funds of a school district any of the proceeds of a district tax not required to provide the full amount of the district budget. Surplus district tax receipts are to be set aside in a reserve fund to the credit of the district and may be expended only by specific request to the county superintendent of schools, and, if the amount requested exceeds \$1000, the request must be published in the same manner as is the district budget.

NON-RESIDENT JUNIOR COLLEGE TUITION

Senate Bill No. 526 as amended by Assembly Bill No. 2442 (S. C. section 4.270) modifies previous School Code provisions relative to non-resident junior college tuition charges. The changes will not be effective until the school year 1934-35, when county junior college tuition taxes will be required to provide payment of the cost of education of all junior college students residing in any county but not in a junior college district nor in a high school district maintaining junior college courses.

Tuition to be paid to junior college districts will include, as heretofore, the actual current expenditures of the junior college district per unit of average daily attendance less state apportionments received by the junior college district during the school year, plus \$65 per unit of non-resident average daily attendance as a charge for use of buildings and equipment. Tuition to be paid to high school districts for non-resident students in junior college courses will include the actual current expenditure of the high school district per unit of average daily attendance less state and county apportionments received by the high school district during the school year, plus \$65 per unit of non-resident average daily attendance as a charge for use of buildings and equipment. The "county apportionments" referred to in the bill will be construed as referring to apportionments received from the STATE GENERAL FUND by the high school district.

No county junior college tuition will be paid after the school year 1933-34 for students residing in a junior college district or in a high school district in which junior college courses are maintained. If junior college students reside in a junior college district or in a high school district in which junior college courses are maintained and attend junior college in another district, contracts should be required covering the attendance and tuition charge for the education of such students. Such contracts would be between junior college districts, between high school districts, or between junior college districts and high school districts.

TABLE No. 1

Revised Estimate of Elementary School Average Daily Attendance, 1932-33, Teacher Units Allowed Thereon for Apportionment Purposes, 1933-34, and Revised Estimate of State Apportionment for Elementary Schools, 1933-34, by Counties

County	Average daily attendance	Teacher units	Estimated apportionment on each basis			Total estimated apportionment
			On teacher units at \$700	On total average daily attendance at \$5.959598+	Excess cost of educating physically handicapped pupils	
Alameda.....	51,885	1,671	\$1,160,700 00	\$309,213 74	\$19,683 23	\$1,498,596 97
Alpine.....	293	3	2,100 00	172 83		2,272 83
Amador.....	993	47	32,900 00	5,917 88		38,817 88
Butte.....	5,259	196	137,200 00	31,341 53		168,541 53
Calaveras.....	756	45	31,500 00	4,505 46		36,005 46
Colusa.....	1,287	57	39,900 00	7,670 00		47,570 00
Contra Costa.....	11,503	393	275,100 00	68,553 26	3,134 52	346,787 78
Del Norte.....	714	28	19,600 00	4,255 15	178 00	24,033 15
El Dorado.....	1,172	72	50,400 00	6,984 65		57,384 65
Fresno.....	23,238	823	576,100 00	138,489 14	2,371 22	716,960 36
Glenn.....	1,790	80	56,000 00	10,667 68	88 13	66,755 81
Humboldt.....	5,543	240	168,000 00	33,034 05	1,539 00	202,573 05
Imperial.....	9,547	332	232,400 00	56,896 28		289,296 28
Inyo.....	828	41	28,700 00	4,934 55		33,634 55
Kern.....	13,093	467	326,900 00	77,969 42		404,869 42
Kings.....	4,324	158	110,600 00	25,769 30		136,369 30
Lake.....	1,078	52	36,400 00	6,424 45	285 04	43,110 39
Lassen.....	1,616	70	49,000 00	9,630 71		58,630 71
Los Angeles.....	260,525	8,353	5,847,100 00	1,552,624 27	98,921 97	7,498,646 24
Madera.....	2,816	116	81,200 00	16,782 23		97,982 23
Marin.....	3,976	151	105,700 00	23,695 36	112 00	129,507 36
Mariposa.....	493	31	21,700 00	2,938 08		24,638 08
Mendocino.....	3,214	167	116,900 00	19,154 15		136,054 15
Merced.....	6,315	231	161,700 00	37,634 86		199,334 86
Modoc.....	966	56	39,200 00	5,756 97		44,956 97
Mono.....	149	9	6,300 00	887 98		7,187 98
Monterey.....	7,493	267	207,900 00	44,655 27	675 00	253,230 27
Napa.....	2,233	94	65,800 00	13,307 78	37 99	79,145 77
Nevada.....	1,405	62	43,400 00	8,373 24		51,773 24
Orange.....	17,193	568	397,600 00	102,463 37	2,863 80	502,927 17
Placer.....	3,973	155	108,500 00	23,677 48		132,177 48
Plumas.....	829	42	29,400 00	4,940 51		34,340 51
Riverside.....	12,011	420	294,000 00	71,580 73		365,580 73
Sacramento.....	17,129	587	410,900 00	102,081 95	3,589 00	516,570 95
San Benito.....	1,526	71	49,700 00	9,094 35		58,794 35
San Bernardino.....	19,449	655	458,500 00	115,908 22	1,668 26	576,076 48
San Diego.....	26,087	889	622,300 00	155,468 03	10,855 99	788,624 02
San Francisco.....	49,218	1,571	1,099,700 00	293,319 49	53,676 00	1,446,695 49
San Joaquin.....	14,301	495	346,500 00	85,228 21	1,237 26	432,965 47
San Luis Obispo.....	3,823	170	119,000 00	22,783 54	100 00	141,883 54
San Mateo.....	10,588	350	245,000 00	63,100 22	3,932 43	312,032 65
Santa Barbara.....	8,230	293	205,100 00	49,047 49	610 81	254,758 30
Santa Clara.....	19,394	657	459,900 00	115,580 44	3,849 67	579,330 11
Santa Cruz.....	4,831	185	129,500 00	28,790 82	1,805 62	160,096 44
Shasta.....	2,035	118	82,600 00	12,127 78		94,727 78
Sierra.....	294	15	10,500 00	1,752 12		12,252 12
Siskiyou.....	3,707	167	116,900 00	22,062 23	69 58	139,061 81
Solano.....	4,516	166	116,200 00	26,913 55	206 55	143,320 10
Sonoma.....	7,940	327	228,900 00	47,319 21		276,219 21
Stanislaus.....	9,210	321	224,700 00	54,887 90	1 27	279,589 17
Sutter.....	2,248	89	62,300 00	13,397 18		75,697 18
Tehama.....	2,009	95	66,500 00	11,972 83		78,472 83
Trinity.....	373	28	19,600 00	2,222 93		21,822 93
Tulare.....	12,474	453	317,100 00	74,340 03		391,440 03
Tuolumne.....	1,193	51	35,700 00	7,109 80		42,809 80
Ventura.....	8,746	302	211,400 00	52,122 64		263,522 64
Yolo.....	3,185	121	84,700 00	18,981 32		103,681 32
Yuba.....	1,501	71	49,700 00	8,945 36	326 00	58,971 36
Totals.....	692,243	23,774	\$16,641,800 00	\$4,125,490 00	\$211,819 24	\$20,979,109 24

TABLE No. 2

Estimate of Apportionments from the State General Fund for Elementary Schools, 1933-34, by Counties

County	1 Revised estimate of apportionment from state school fund	2 1932-33 average daily attendance times \$30	3 State general fund ap- portionment for elementary schools (greater of amounts entered in Columns 1 and 2)	4 Deduction for unapportioned county elementary school fund (5% of 1932-33 apportionment from state school fund)	5 Balance for apportionment to school districts and to county elementary school super- vision fund (Column 3- Column 4)
Alameda	\$1,498,596 97	\$1,556,550 00	\$1,556,550 00	\$76,098 19	\$1,480,451 81
Alpine	2,272 83	870 00	2,272 83	113 02	2,159 81
Amador	38,817 88	29,790 00	38,817 88	1,892 39	36,925 49
Butte	168,541 53	157,770 00	168,541 53	8,311 21	160,230 32
Calaveras	36,005 46	22,680 00	36,005 46	1,642 56	34,362 90
Colusa	47,570 00	38,610 00	47,570 00	2,464 38	45,105 62
Contra Costa	346,787 78	345,090 00	346,787 78	17,497 72	329,290 06
Del Norte	24,033 15	21,420 00	24,033 15	1,109 64	22,923 51
El Dorado	57,384 65	35,160 00	57,384 65	2,625 35	54,759 30
Fresno	716,960 36	697,140 00	716,960 36	36,414 61	680,545 75
Glenn	66,755 81	53,700 00	66,755 81	3,390 33	63,365 48
Humboldt	202,573 05	166,290 00	202,573 05	10,391 09	192,181 96
Imperial	289,296 28	286,410 00	289,296 28	14,533 43	274,762 85
Inyo	33,634 55	24,840 00	33,634 55	1,656 26	31,978 29
Kern	404,869 42	392,490 00	404,869 42	20,191 85	384,677 57
Kings	136,369 30	129,720 00	136,369 30	6,714 56	129,654 74
Lake	43,110 39	32,340 00	43,110 39	2,148 32	40,962 07
Lassen	58,630 71	48,480 00	58,630 71	3,060 98	55,569 73
Los Angeles	7,498,646 24	7,815,750 00	7,815,750 00	366,739 39	7,449,010 61
Madera	97,982 23	84,480 00	97,982 23	5,199 87	92,782 36
Marin	129,507 36	119,280 00	129,507 36	6,444 81	123,062 55
Mariposa	24,638 08	14,790 00	24,638 08	1,177 09	23,460 99
Mendocino	136,054 15	96,420 00	136,054 15	6,907 62	129,146 53
Merced	199,334 86	189,450 00	199,334 86	10,046 78	189,288 08
Modoc	44,956 97	28,980 00	44,956 97	2,315 65	42,641 32
Mono	7,187 98	4,470 00	7,187 98	389 79	6,798 19
Monterey	253,230 27	224,790 00	253,230 27	12,818 96	240,411 31
Napa	79,145 77	66,990 00	79,145 77	4,217 54	74,928 23
Nevada	51,773 24	42,150 00	51,773 24	2,534 68	49,238 56
Orange	502,927 17	515,790 00	515,790 00	25,790 12	489,999 88
Placer	132,177 48	119,190 00	132,177 48	6,561 43	125,616 05
Plumas	34,340 51	24,870 00	34,340 51	1,722 10	32,618 41
Riverside	365,580 73	360,330 00	365,580 73	17,725 99	347,854 74
Sacramento	516,570 95	513,870 00	516,570 95	26,101 59	490,469 36
San Benito	58,794 35	45,780 00	58,794 35	3,110 49	55,683 86
San Bernardino	576,076 48	583,470 00	583,470 00	28,638 30	554,831 70
San Diego	788,624 02	782,610 00	788,624 02	38,090 39	750,533 63
San Francisco	1,446,695 49	1,476,540 00	1,476,540 00	71,507 55	1,405,032 45
San Joaquin	432,965 47	429,030 00	432,965 47	21,702 87	411,262 60
San Luis Obispo	141,883 54	114,690 00	141,883 54	7,032 32	134,851 22
San Mateo	312,032 65	317,640 00	317,640 00	15,470 02	302,169 98
Santa Barbara	254,758 30	246,900 00	254,758 30	12,877 43	241,880 87
Santa Clara	579,330 11	581,820 00	581,820 00	29,691 38	552,128 62
Santa Cruz	160,096 44	144,930 00	160,096 44	7,932 20	152,164 24
Shasta	94,727 78	61,050 00	94,727 78	4,639 62	90,088 16
Sierra	12,252 12	8,820 00	12,252 12	572 25	11,679 87
Siskiyou	139,061 81	111,210 00	139,061 81	6,974 51	132,087 30
Solano	143,320 10	135,480 00	143,320 10	7,218 76	136,101 34
Sonoma	276,219 21	238,200 00	276,219 21	13,873 01	262,346 20
Stanislaus	279,589 17	276,300 00	279,589 17	14,130 02	265,459 15
Sutter	75,697 18	67,440 00	75,697 18	3,910 97	71,786 21
Tehama	78,472 83	60,270 00	78,472 83	3,915 01	74,557 82
Trinity	21,822 93	11,190 00	21,822 93	1,084 52	20,738 41
Tulare	391,440 03	374,220 00	391,440 03	20,266 60	371,173 43
Tuolumne	42,809 80	35,790 00	42,809 80	2,126 18	40,683 62
Ventura	263,522 64	262,380 00	263,522 64	12,908 31	250,614 33
Yolo	103,681 32	95,550 00	103,681 32	5,260 84	98,420 48
Yuba	58,971 36	45,030 00	58,971 36	2,899 89	56,071 47
Totals	\$20,979,109 24	\$20,767,290 00	\$21,412,364 13	\$1,042,782 94	\$20,369,581 19

TABLE No. 3

Revised Estimate of High School Average Daily Attendance and Years Maintained, 1932-33, and of State Apportionment for High Schools, 1933-34, by Counties

County	Average daily attendance	Years maintained	Estimated apportionment on each basis				
			On years maintained at \$550	Bonus on special day and evening A. D. A.	On total average daily attendance at \$24.3899184+	Excess cost of educating physically handicapped pupils	Total estimated apportionment
Alameda.....	25,604	122	\$67,100 00	\$47,200 00	\$626,674 56	\$7,082 05	\$748,056 61
Alpine.....							
Amador.....	347	12	6,600 00		8,463 30		15,063 30
Butte.....	2,061	23	12,650 00	1,800 00	50,267 62		64,717 62
Calaveras.....	263	8	4,400 00		6,414 55		10,814 55
Colusa.....	581	17	9,350 00	720 00	14,170 54		24,240 54
Contra Costa.....	3,898	33	18,150 00	9,300 00	95,071 90		122,521 90
Del Norte.....	235	4	2,200 00	480 00	5,731 63		8,411 63
El Dorado.....	358	4	2,200 00		8,731 59		10,931 59
Fresno.....	8,906	99	54,450 00	16,400 00	217,216 61		288,066 61
Glenn.....	663	19	10,450 00		16,170 52		26,620 52
Humboldt.....	2,121	20	11,000 00	2,860 00	51,731 02		65,591 02
Imperial.....	2,058	34	18,700 00	1,780 00	50,194 45		70,674 45
Inyo.....	254	16	8,800 00	80 00	6,195 04		15,075 04
Kern.....	5,244	40	22,000 00	7,080 00	127,900 73	554 56	157,535 29
Kings.....	1,238	16	8,800 00	2,680 00	30,194 72		41,674 72
Lake.....	400	20	11,000 00	80 00	9,755 97		20,835 97
Lassen.....	681	14	7,700 00	1,420 00	16,609 53		25,729 53
Los Angeles.....	109,879	455	250,250 00	215,400 00	2,679,939 85	22,429 18	3,168,019 03
Madera.....	869	12	6,600 00	800 00	21,194 84		28,594 84
Marin.....	1,882	12	6,600 00	2,580 00	45,901 83		55,081 83
Mariposa.....	119	4	2,200 00		2,902 40		5,102 40
Mendocino.....	1,277	40	22,000 00	2,520 00	31,145 93		55,665 93
Merced.....	1,793	28	15,400 00	1,660 00	43,731 12		60,791 12
Modoc.....	336	20	11,000 00		8,195 01		19,195 01
Mono.....	6				146 34		146 34
Monterey.....	2,153	30	16,500 00	4,080 00	52,511 49		73,091 49
Napa.....	925	12	6,600 00	1,120 00	22,560 67		30,280 67
Nevada.....	568	12	6,600 00	160 00	13,853 47		20,613 47
Orange.....	6,311	49	26,950 00	11,840 00	153,924 78		192,714 78
Placer.....	1,287	16	8,800 00	2,040 00	31,389 83		42,229 83
Plumas.....	222	12	6,600 00		5,414 56		12,014 56
Riverside.....	3,652	42	23,100 00	4,980 00	89,071 98		117,151 98
Sacramento.....	6,475	36	19,800 00	7,060 00	157,924 72	443 00	185,227 72
San Benito.....	557	6	3,300 00		13,585 19		16,885 19
San Bernardino.....	6,161	57	31,350 00	7,600 00	150,266 29	10 00	189,226 29
San Diego.....	9,696	76	41,800 00	21,300 00	236,484 65		299,584 65
San Francisco.....	22,704	59	32,450 00	23,260 00	553,748 71	1,660 83	611,119 54
San Joaquin.....	4,839	36	19,800 00	5,360 00	118,022 82		143,182 82
San Luis Obispo.....	1,388	32	17,600 00	3,640 00	33,853 21		55,093 21
San Mateo.....	3,728	28	15,400 00	5,260 00	90,925 62		111,585 62
Santa Barbara.....	3,069	27	14,850 00	6,100 00	74,852 66	30 80	95,833 46
Santa Clara.....	7,762	52	28,600 00	20,280 00	189,314 55	285 00	238,479 55
Santa Cruz.....	1,922	22	12,100 00	6,740 00	46,877 42	62 00	65,779 42
Shasta.....	674	12	6,600 00	80 00	16,438 81		23,118 81
Sierra.....	88	16	8,800 00		2,146 31		10,946 31
Siskiyou.....	1,207	34	18,700 00	3,880 00	29,438 63		52,018 63
Solano.....	1,912	28	15,400 00	3,560 00	46,633 52		65,593 52
Sonoma.....	2,899	34	18,700 00	6,800 00	70,706 37		96,206 37
Stanislaus.....	3,314	32	17,600 00	2,260 00	80,828 19		100,688 19
Sutter.....	763	16	8,800 00	620 00	18,609 51		28,329 51
Tehama.....	738	12	6,600 00	560 00	17,999 76		25,159 76
Trinity.....	81	4	2,200 00		1,975 58		4,175 58
Tulare.....	4,268	52	28,600 00	11,760 00	104,036 17		144,456 17
Tuolumne.....	447	8	4,400 00	80 00	10,902 29		15,382 29
Ventura.....	2,882	36	19,800 00	6,080 00	70,291 75		96,171 75
Yolo.....	1,017	20	11,000 00		24,804 55		35,804 55
Yuba.....	579	10	5,500 00	1,720 00	14,121 76		21,341 76
Totals.....	275,451	1,990	\$1,094,500 00	\$483,360 00	\$6,718,227 42	\$32,557 42	\$8,328,644 84

TABLE No. 4

Estimate of Apportionments from the State General Fund for High Schools, 1933-34, by Counties

County	1 Revised estimate of apportionment from state high school fund	2 Column 1 multiplied by 2	3 1932-33 average daily attendance times \$80	4 State general fund apportionment for high schools (greater of amounts entered in Columns 2 and 3)	5 Deduction for unapportioned county high school fund (5% of 1932-33 apportionment from state high school fund)	6 Balance for apportionment to high school districts (Column 4- Column 5)
Alameda	\$748,056 61	\$1,496,113 22	\$1,541,640 00	\$1,541,640 00	\$34,588 38	\$1,507,051 62
Alpine						
Amador	15,063 30	30,126 60	20,820 00	30,126 60	727 10	29,399 50
Butte	64,717 62	129,435 24	123,660 00	129,435 24	3,169 55	126,265 69
Calaveras	10,814 55	21,629 10	15,780 00	21,629 10	526 61	21,102 49
Colusa	24,240 54	48,481 08	34,860 00	48,481 08	1,298 95	47,182 13
Contra Costa	122,521 90	245,043 80	233,880 00	245,043 80	6,268 11	238,775 69
Del Norte	8,411 63	16,823 26	14,100 00	16,823 26	373 09	16,450 17
El Dorado	10,931 59	21,863 18	21,480 00	21,863 18	504 71	21,358 47
Fresno	288,066 61	576,133 22	534,360 00	576,133 22	13,948 81	562,184 41
Glenn	26,620 52	53,241 04	39,780 00	53,241 04	1,196 75	52,044 29
Humboldt	65,591 02	131,182 04	127,260 00	131,182 04	3,396 19	127,785 85
Imperial	70,674 45	141,348 90	123,480 00	141,348 90	3,614 44	137,734 46
Inyo	15,075 04	30,150 08	15,240 00	30,150 08	739 43	29,410 65
Kern	157,535 29	315,070 58	314,640 00	315,070 58	7,684 54	307,386 04
Kings	41,674 72	83,349 44	74,280 00	83,349 44	2,057 75	81,291 69
Lake	20,835 97	41,671 94	24,000 00	41,671 94	1,025 75	40,646 19
Lassen	25,729 53	51,459 06	40,860 00	51,459 06	1,212 55	50,246 51
Los Angeles	3,168,019 03	6,336,038 06	6,592,740 00	6,592,740 00	146,341 02	6,446,398 98
Madera	28,594 84	57,189 68	52,140 00	57,189 68	1,495 01	55,694 67
Marin	55,081 83	110,163 66	112,920 00	112,920 00	2,619 57	110,300 43
Mariposa	5,102 40	10,204 80	7,140 00	10,204 80	224 82	9,979 98
Mendocino	55,665 93	111,331 86	76,620 00	111,331 86	2,661 32	108,670 54
Merced	60,791 12	121,582 24	107,580 00	121,582 24	3,011 13	118,571 11
Modoc	19,195 01	38,390 02	20,160 00	38,390 02	896 87	37,493 15
Mono	146 34	292 68	360 00	360 00	7 18	352 82
Monterey	73,091 49	146,182 98	129,180 00	146,182 98	3,677 75	142,505 23
Napa	30,280 67	60,561 34	55,500 00	60,561 34	1,409 89	59,151 45
Nevada	20,613 47	41,226 94	34,080 00	41,226 94	962 77	40,264 17
Orange	192,714 78	385,429 56	378,660 00	385,429 56	9,860 32	375,569 24
Placer	42,229 83	84,459 66	77,220 00	84,459 66	2,080 87	82,378 79
Plumas	12,014 56	24,029 12	13,790 00	24,029 12	566 08	23,463 04
Riverside	117,151 98	234,303 96	219,120 00	234,303 96	5,738 32	228,565 64
Sacramento	185,227 72	370,455 44	388,500 00	388,500 00	8,917 29	379,582 71
San Benito	16,885 19	33,770 38	33,420 00	33,770 38	871 87	32,898 51
San Bernardino	189,226 29	378,452 58	369,660 00	378,452 58	9,022 61	369,429 97
San Diego	299,584 65	599,169 30	581,760 00	599,169 30	13,968 87	585,200 43
San Francisco	611,119 54	1,222,239 08	1,362,240 00	1,362,240 00	28,714 56	1,333,525 44
San Joaquin	143,182 82	286,365 64	290,340 00	290,340 00	6,832 87	283,507 13
San Luis Obispo	55,093 21	110,186 42	83,280 00	110,186 42	2,666 34	107,520 08
San Mateo	111,585 62	223,171 24	223,680 00	223,680 00	5,392 73	218,287 27
Santa Barbara	95,833 46	191,666 92	184,140 00	191,666 92	4,685 16	186,981 76
Santa Clara	238,479 55	476,959 10	465,730 00	476,959 10	11,106 10	465,853 00
Santa Cruz	65,779 42	131,558 84	115,320 00	131,558 84	3,122 31	128,436 53
Shasta	23,118 81	46,237 62	40,440 00	46,237 62	1,116 24	45,121 38
Sierra	10,946 31	21,892 62	5,280 00	21,892 62	396 99	21,495 63
Siskiyou	52,018 63	104,037 26	72,420 00	104,037 26	2,655 66	101,381 60
Solano	65,593 52	131,187 04	114,720 00	131,187 04	3,124 93	128,062 11
Sonoma	96,206 37	192,412 74	173,940 00	192,412 74	4,575 80	187,836 94
Stanislaus	100,688 19	201,376 38	198,840 00	201,376 38	4,958 47	196,417 91
Sutter	28,329 51	56,659 02	45,780 00	56,659 02	1,346 65	55,312 37
Tehama	25,159 76	50,319 52	44,280 00	50,319 52	1,204 83	49,114 69
Trinity	4,175 58	8,351 16	4,860 00	8,351 16	186 55	8,164 61
Tulare	144,456 17	288,912 34	256,080 00	288,912 34	6,895 79	282,016 55
Tuolumne	15,382 29	30,764 58	26,820 00	30,764 58	751 10	30,013 48
Ventura	96,171 75	192,343 50	172,920 00	192,343 50	4,678 78	187,664 72
Yolo	35,804 55	71,609 10	61,020 00	71,609 10	1,657 52	69,951 58
Yuba	21,341 76	42,683 52	34,740 00	42,683 52	996 12	41,687 40
Totals	\$8,328,644 84	\$16,657,289 68	\$16,527,060 00	\$17,124,870 66	\$393,731 77	\$16,731,138 89

TABLE No. 5

Revised Estimate of District Junior College Average Daily Attendance, 1932-33, and State Apportionment, 1933-34, by Districts and Counties*

County and district	Average daily attendance	Estimated apportionments		
		Junior college allotment	On average daily attendance at \$73.92	Total
Los Angeles County—				
Compton.....	594	\$2,000	\$43,908 48	\$45,908 48
Glendale.....	821	2,000	60,688 32	62,688 32
Long Beach.....	1,395	2,000	103,118 40	105,118 40
Los Angeles.....	4,692	2,000	346,832 64	348,832 64
Pasadena.....	2,185	2,000	161,515 20	163,515 20
County totals.....	9,687	\$10,000	\$716,063 04	\$726,063 04
Marin County—				
Marin (Kentfield).....	405	\$2,000	\$29,937 60	\$31,937 60
Orange County—				
Fullerton.....	697	\$2,000	\$51,522 24	\$53,522 24
Santa Ana.....	750	2,000	55,440 00	57,440 00
County totals.....	1,447	\$4,000	\$106,962 24	\$110,962 24
Riverside County—				
Riverside.....	520	\$2,000	\$38,438 40	\$40,438 40
Sacramento County—				
Sacramento.....	1,830	\$2,000	\$135,273 60	\$137,273 60
San Bernardino County—				
Chaffey (Ontario).....	762	\$2,000	\$56,327 04	\$58,327 04
San Bernardino Valley (San Bernardino).....	662	2,000	48,935 04	50,935 04
County totals.....	1,424	\$4,000	\$105,262 08	\$109,262 08
San Mateo County—				
San Mateo.....	1,243	\$2,000	\$91,882 56	\$93,882 56
Santa Clara County—				
San Jose.....	771	\$2,000	\$56,992 32	\$58,992 32
Sonoma County—				
Santa Rosa.....	376	\$2,000	\$27,793 92	\$29,793 92
Stanislaus County—				
Modesto.....	877	\$2,000	\$64,827 84	\$66,827 84
Yuba County—				
Yuba County (Marysville).....	216	\$2,000	\$15,966 72	\$17,966 72
STATE TOTALS.....	18,796	\$34,000	\$1,389,400 32	\$1,423,400 32

*Total apportionment includes an estimated receipt from the Federal Government of \$400,000 plus \$1,023,529.00 which constitutes one-half of the total legislative appropriation for the biennium 1933-35. Estimate of federal apportionment subject to revision.

DEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATIONS

Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction

VIERLING KERSEY, *Superintendent*

REQUIRED SCHOOL BUS COLORS

The State Board of Education meeting in San Francisco, July 8, 1933, added Section 16 to the State Board of Education Regulations Governing Pupil Transportation, which section reads as follows:

16. The body, fenders, hood and wheels of each school bus, the purchase of which is contracted for after July 15, 1933, and of each school bus repainted after said date, shall be painted medium chrome yellow excepting that any molding thereon shall be black. All lettering placed upon a school bus so painted or repainted shall be unshaded and shall be black on a background of medium chrome yellow.

This new regulation will, as in the case of the other regulations, be enforced by the California Highway Patrol.

DR. RICCIARDI ASSUMES NEW POSITION

Dr. Nicholas Ricciardi, Chief of the Division of Secondary Education, will sever his connections with the State Department of Education on August 16, 1933, to become head of the San Bernardino Valley Union Junior College.

Dr. Ricciardi's services in the State Department of Education began when he assumed the presidency of the California Polytechnic School at San Luis Obispo on July 1, 1921. He was elected to that position by the State Board of Education on the nomination of Will C. Wood, then Superintendent of Public Instruction.

His success at the California Polytechnic School led to his being selected by the State Board of Education to succeed Dr. Edwin R. Snyder as Commissioner of Vocational Education on February 1, 1924. Three years later he was made Chief of the Division of City Secondary Schools by Mr. Wood's successor, Superintendent William John Cooper. In 1931, Superintendent Vierling Kersey, in reorganizing the Department of Education, assigned the responsibility for all secondary education to Dr. Ricciardi as Chief of the Division of Secondary Education.

During the period of service in this last position, Dr. Ricciardi took a leading part in connection with all problems affecting California junior colleges. His selection for the important position he is now to assume is a deserved recognition of his contribution to the advancement of the junior college movement in this state. The years of service and experience in the field of the junior college which Dr. Ricciardi brings with him to his new position should serve well the young people of the community to which he goes.

At this writing no successor has been named to fill the vacancy caused by Dr. Ricciardi's resignation.

DR. STOLZ JOINS STAFF OF OAKLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

It is with much regret that the resignation of Dr. Herbert R. Stolz, Chief of the Bureau of Parent Education of the State Department of Education, has been accepted. Dr. Stolz has been with the department since 1920 when he was appointed Assistant Supervisor of Physical Education. In 1922 he succeeded Dr. Clark W. Hetherington as State Supervisor of Physical Education. His training as a physician was particularly valuable in this work. During his service in this position, he was able to develop a program of health and physical education throughout the state that was recognized as one of the most progressive in the nation.

In 1926, Dr. Stolz resigned as State Supervisor of Physical Education to direct a new service of the department. He became Chief of the Division of Adult and Parent Education, this service being financed by a grant from the Laura Spellman Rockefeller Foundation. In 1927, he assumed the directorship of the Institute of Child Welfare at the University of California, this service also being financed by the above named foundation, and continued his work with the State Department of Education as Chief of the Bureau of Parent Education. Under the leadership of Dr. Stolz the work of the Institute of Child Welfare has received world-wide commendation. His work in parent education has been responsible for the development of an exceptionally fine program in this field.

Dr. Stolz has accepted the newly created position of Director of Child Welfare in the Oakland public schools, where he will be in charge of health service, health education, physical education, attendance service, and psychological adjustment cases. While we recognize our loss in his leaving the State Department of Education, we congratulate the Oakland public schools upon the selection of Dr. Stolz to head this work in Oakland. We know that his leadership in this field will bring rich returns to the children of Oakland.

Division of Secondary Education

N. RICCIARDI, *Chief*

MESSAGE OF APPRECIATION

The State of California is fortunate, indeed, to have engaged in secondary education men and women who consider the discharge of their duties and responsibilities a rich opportunity and a privilege to serve modern American youth.

It has been my good fortune to be associated with and to work with these individuals who are actuated by high purposes. To accomplish these purposes, to the benefit of youth and of society, has been our vital common concern in cooperative endeavor.

As I am about to assume the office of President of the San Bernardino Valley Union Junior College, I wish to express my sincere appreciation of the loyal and inspiring support accorded me during the past nine years in our cooperative endeavor directed to fitting youth to live efficiently in modern American life.

NICHOLAS RICCIARDI,
Chief, Division of Secondary Education

Division of Research and Statistics

WALTER E. MORGAN, *Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction
and Chief, Division of Research and Statistics*

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT CONTRACTS

Elsewhere in this number is given a summary of the Attorney General's Opinion No. 8707, given July 1, 1933, to the district attorney of San Benito County, holding that governing boards of elementary school districts are without power to contract for the education of all pupils of a district by other districts. County superintendents of schools and elementary school district officials should observe this opinion, since under it no apportionment of state funds will be allowed any elementary school district in 1934-35 for any district failing to maintain its own school in 1933-34.

This opinion will not modify apportionments to be made during the current school year on account of such districts as provided for the education of their pupils by contract during 1932-33.

Division of Textbooks and Publications

IVAN R. WATERMAN, *Chief*

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Statistics of California City School Districts for the School Year Ending June 30, 1932. Department of Education Bulletin No. 7, July 1, 1933.

This bulletin presents basic and computed data relative to kindergartens, elementary schools, junior high schools, and high schools of the 45 city elementary school districts and of the 35 city high school districts and 10 union high school districts in which the city elementary school districts are located. The content of this bulletin is similar to previous bulletins of the Department of Education presenting statistics of city school districts.

Aims and Desired Outcomes of Typewriting in California Secondary Schools. Department of Education Bulletin No. 8. July 15, 1933.

The materials of this bulletin were prepared by a committee of representative teachers of commercial subjects throughout the state under the direction of Ira W. Kibby, Chief of the Bureau of Business Education of the State Department of Education. It deals with aims and desired outcomes of typewriting and suggests practices in accordance with these aims and outcomes.

Lessons of Practical Information. Department of Education Bulletin No. 9. August 1, 1933.

This volume is an addition to the series of lesson and drill materials for adult classes in English published by the State Department of Education. It is recommended for use in intermediate classes of adults.

California Journal of Elementary Education. Volume II, Number 1.
August, 1933.

This number marks the beginning of the second year of the *California Journal of Elementary Education*, a quarterly publication issued by the California State Department of Education and devoted primarily to articles dealing with problems of organization, administration, supervision, and instruction in the elementary school.

The journal is distributed free of charge to California city and county superintendents, district superintendents in charge of elementary schools, elementary school principals in schools of four or more teachers, and to a selected list of instructors in teacher training institutions. To others, the subscription price is \$1.00 a year or 30 cents for single copies. Subscription orders should be sent to the Division of Textbooks and Publications.

INTERPRETATIONS OF SCHOOL LAW

Appellate Court Decisions

Liability of District for Injuries to Pupils Transported

A bus operated only for the convenience of a particular school is a private carrier and ordinary prudence for the safety of children is all that is required of the district or the driver of the bus.

A school district is liable for injuries sustained by a pupil struck by an automobile in attempting to cross a public highway to his home after alighting from a bus operated by a school district where it appears that the bus stopped on the paved portion of the highway in violation of section 136 of the California Vehicle Act and the driver of the bus saw the automobile which injured the pupil approaching but failed to warn the pupil of its presence; the pupil was not guilty of contributory negligence as a matter of law in not looking for approaching automobiles before attempting to cross the highway. (*Shannon et al. vs. Central-Gattner Union School District et al.*, 74 C.A.D. 98, --Pac.--.)

Attorney General's Opinions

Application of Tenure Law

Where an elementary school district and a high school district are coterminous, the requirement of less than 850 average daily attendance prescribed in School Code section 5.501, refers in the case of the elementary district to the average daily attendance in elementary schools of the district without including the average daily attendance in high schools, and that in the case of the high school district the figure of less than 850 refers solely to attendance in the high schools of the district. (A.G.O. 8626, June 17, 1933)

Constitutionality of School Code Section 2.464

School Code section 2.464 is not in violation of section 18 of Article XI of the State Constitution in requiring a tax on the property of an elementary school district coming within the provisions of said section for a proportion of the interest and principal on the bonds of the high school district in question. (A.G.O. 8654, June 30, 1933)

Contracts for Education of Elementary Pupils

There is no authority for an elementary school district to enter into a contract under School Code section 2.20 with one or more adjoining elementary school districts whereby such district agrees to educate

all the pupils of such adjoining district or districts. Cited are section 5 of Article V of the Constitution, *Rice vs. McClellan* (202 Cal. 650); *Bay View School District vs. Linscott* (99 Cal. 25); *Sunol School District vs. Chipman* (138 Cal. 251); Opinion No. 8642 of the Attorney General. (A.G.O. 8797, July 31, 1933.)

Discontinuance of Kindergartens

Under School Code section 3.112, the governing board of an elementary school district maintaining two or more kindergartens may reduce the number of such kindergartens to not less than one, and under School Code section 3.140, the governing board of an elementary school district maintaining but one kindergarten may not discontinue such kindergarten at the close of a school year unless the average daily attendance thereof for the school year was ten or less. (A.G.O. 8134a, June 30, 1933)

Illegal Contracts Between High School Districts for Education of Pupils

Under the authority of *Rice vs. McClellan* (202 Cal. 650), a contract under which one high school district contracts to have all its pupils educated by another high school district is illegal, whether such contract is entered into under School Code section 3.308 or under School Code section 2.20; and the attendance of the pupils of the first mentioned high school district cannot be credited to the said district and no apportionment of state or county funds may be made to such district under School Code sections 4.870-4.879 and 4.890-4.896, nor may a high school district tax be levied upon the district of residence under School Code sections 4.370-4.377. (A.G.O. 8642, June 27, 1933)

Powers of Electors at District Meetings

School Code sections 2.850-2.859 do not permit the electors of a school district at a meeting called and held under said sections to instruct the governing board of the school district in regard to the employment, dismissal or reinstatement of certificated employees of the district. (A.G.O. 8624, June 16, 1933)

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

MESSAGE FROM WM. JOHN COOPER

Wm. John Cooper, former U. S. Commissioner of Education, through *School Life*, official journal of the U. S. Office of Education, conveys a message of commendation to America's school teachers and school administrators.

As we come to the end of another school year, I commend the school people of the United States for their service and sacrifice in helping to keep open our institutions of learning, and in helping to maintain our Nation's high standards of education reached only by hard work over long periods of time. Next school year will call for continued sacrifice, but I know that our teachers and school administrators will carry on courageously, as they have in the past.

I wish that all those who clamor for tax reduction could have opportunity to see what the Nations of Europe went through during the last four years of war, and how well they stood for taxation for schools. I would that they might look back to our own previous depressions and see what communities have stood rather than let their children go without current schooling. I know at those times the average standard of living was not so high. People were not accustomed to certain comforts and luxuries which they now enjoy. Therefore today it seems harder to make sacrifices for schools.

But let me call to your attention the fact that as a civilization increases in complexity, schooling is more necessary than ever before. For people who lived in an agricultural stage when roads were poor and towns were small and far apart, less schooling was necessary. Literacy was the main requirement. People were born practically under the same conditions and into the same conditions in which their parents were born, and would live most of their lives in those conditions.

Today we live in a complex civilization which it is necessary to understand in order to be adjusted to it. Schools are the means by which we accomplish this period of adjustment.

PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE

REVIEWS

FRANCES G. SWEENEY, EMILY FANNING BARRY, and ALICE E. SCHOELKOPF. *Western Youth Meets Eastern Culture*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, for Lincoln School of Teachers Colleges, 1932. xvi+335pp.

Western Youth Meets Eastern Culture is the report of three years of experimenting at Lincoln Junior High School with an integrated curriculum, organized around the interests and needs of the learner, and utilizing materials selected from large areas of human experience regardless of subject matter fields.

The study is predicated on an acknowledgment that social vision has failed to keep pace with mechanical progress. The maintenance of modern society demands intelligent social control devoted to the welfare of the whole community. To prepare young people to participate in community life guided by social ideals, the secondary school curriculum must be completely reorganized to help every young person to understand the civilization in which he lives, to develop an understanding of the problems of other members and groups of society, and to grow in realization that the common good requires him to act for the welfare of others.

The accomplishment of these purposes demands the elimination of rigid subject matter divisions and a "new synthesis of content in closely related fields." Teachers of three subjects, social studies, English, and art, cooperated in the experiment to develop a few large concepts from various angles and to permit the children to integrate their experiences, coordinate their knowledge, and provide opportunity for new interests and activities.

Chapter II presents the individual points of view of the three teachers concerning the subject field of each. Although each sees the integrity of the field represented there is no conflict in their points of view. Social studies orient children to the "present day world by a study of the development of civilization." English must "open up for children the storehouse of literature for any period of the world's development or any race of people" if it is to contribute to the larger aspects of life and living. Art "emerges from the needs and ideals of a people." And so each teacher emphasizes important concepts which flower most fully through integration and may be utterly lost by isolation.

In the set-up of the experiment a teacher was released from each subject matter field for two or three hours each day to work together with the group of children. Social studies were selected as the core subject. The need of flexibility of program became immediately apparent. The need of suitable instructional material led to a search through available library resources, for no one textbook could meet all the needs. The experiment in integration covered a period of three years. No group was in excess of 30. The intelligence quotient range was from 96 to 159 in the entire group.

It is immediately apparent that the conditions of the experiment could not be reproduced under present concepts of adequate support in any public school. The accomplishment even under idealistic circumstances, offers not only suggestions for the organization of instructional procedures and curriculum content, but may imply the greater values which may accrue to children from an education conceived on a more liberal basis than at present is considered adequate for public education.

Definite standards were established as a basis for determining what unit would be selected. The following criteria were used: the content must be of social significance; the content must be within the comprehensions of children in the grade in which it is to be taught; the content must be broad enough in scope and rich and varied enough in experience to provide and stimulate the creative outlet for all

children; the content must furnish opportunity for cumulative growth on increasingly higher levels of achievement; the content must provide opportunity for intensifying and amplifying the esthetic elements.

The organization of the working plan for each unit was not formalized but had a certain structural basis which guaranteed "arriving at a whole, coordinated in all its parts." This organization provided for *orientation*, or an opportunity for the child to become acquainted with the general sphere of socially significant culture; *special activities*, in which the child was free to select the aspect of the unit of greatest interest to him and to express his ideas through the medium of his greatest aptitude; and *summarization*, or an opportunity to pool the accomplishments of each in some culminating group expression.

Description of the creative activities constitutes the illustrative material of more than half the book. This material is of particular interest to the teacher who is seeking answers to such pertinent questions as: What is the value of integration? What are the materials and procedures of integrated teaching? How can the administrative difficulties be met? How can the teacher be confident that the results in terms of child growth will be satisfactory?

The thoughtful teacher will find delightful and convincing answers to the questions. In the experiences of these teachers will be found the advantage of voluntary cooperative activities; the revitalization of subject matter resulting from realignment; new enthusiasm in pupils resulting in interesting individual creative expression, and a new artistry in the process of teaching which is at once intellectual stimulation and professional reward.

HELEN HEFFERNAN

FREDERICK S. BREED. *Classroom Organization and Management*. Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Company, 1933. xvi+472 pp.

The latest addition to the Measurement and Adjustment Series edited by Lewis M. Terman is this new book on classroom management. It is designed primarily to serve as a text for prospective teachers in both the elementary and the secondary school. The treatment of the subject in this book represents a distinct departure from that accorded by previous books in the field of classroom management. The general aim has been to bring to bear upon problems of organization and management of classroom activities the results of scientific studies in education. Particular stress has been placed upon the contributions of educational measurement.

The author defines classroom management as "dealing with those duties of classroom teachers that lie outside the field of instructional methodology, which in turn is defined as the direction of learning in school subjects. Those classroom tasks, therefore, that are not directly involved in the guidance of learning, in the mastery of curriculum units, are regarded as belonging within the scope of the book. Classroom management thus defined does not overlap the domain of methods. It parallels and supplements it. It deals, in a word, with the extra-instructional activities of the teacher." While this definition serves well in a general way to set apart the field of classroom management, it would be difficult to apply it in a hard and fast manner. Certain portions of the content of the book seem to be not strictly in accord with the definition. For example, the discussion of remedial teaching following diagnostic testing might properly be considered as lying within the field of teaching methods. The subject of grouping pupils, also treated, is usually considered an administrative function and not within what might be classified as "extra-instructional duties of the teacher."

The scope of the book is well indicated by the chapter headings: The Field of Classroom Management, Nature and Uses of Standard Tests, The Technique of Testing, Miscellaneous Grouping of Pupils, Homogeneous Grouping, The Individual System of Instruction, Organizing Supervised Study, How Large Should Classes Be? Plans of Promoting Pupils, Constructing the Curriculum, Sponsoring Extracurricular Activities, Making the Schedule of Classes, Constructing New-Type Examinations, Assignment of Marks, School Bookkeeping, Organizing Routine Activities, Reconstructing the Behavior of Pupils.

The treatment of the subject is both theoretical and practical. There is avoided on the one hand the laying down of rules and procedures without reasons and explanations of principles involved, and on the other, the presentation of theoretical discussions without examples of application in classroom procedure. While the wide scope of the book makes impossible an extended or intensive treatment of any one of the topics, the chapters are well organized and present in good manner the major aspects of the topics covered. At the end of each chapter are well selected "suggestions for required reading" and "suggestions for optional reading."

The content is largely of a nature not encountered in the courses included in the usual required training program for teachers, but which would be found only in certain rather specialized courses. The fundamental importance of the material treated in this book justifies its inclusion in the content of the training program for all teachers. This book should prove valuable as a text in a new type of course in classroom management and may be expected to act as an influence to modify the content of existing courses in this subject.

IVAN R. WATERMAN

CURRENT PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges. Vol. XIX, No. 2, May, 1933.
Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Association of American Colleges.

CLIFTON, JOHN LEROY. *Ten Famous American Educators.* Columbus, Ohio: R. G. Adams and Company, 1933.

HISSONG, CLYDE, and HISSONG, MARY. *An Introduction to the Principles of Teaching.* Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Company, 1933.

Third Yearbook: Supervision in the Social Studies. Compiled by a committee of the National Council for the Social Studies. Philadelphia: McKinley Publishing Company, 1933.

WATSON, GLADYS HIPPLE. *Success and Failure in the Teaching Profession.* New York: Department of Philosophy, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932.

CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

1915

Published by the State of California

Under the authority of the State Board of Education